

## REMARKS

The Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the comments set forth in the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004. All of the rejections are respectfully traversed. Amendment, reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

### The Office Action

In the Office Action mailed October 6, 2004:

**Claims 1-17** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,901,287 to Bull, et al. ("Bull").

### Telephone Interview Summary

On or about November 15, 2004, one of the Applicants' representatives, Mr. Thomas Tillander, contacted the Examiner to ask for clarification regarding Section 12 of the Office Action. Section 12 of the Office Action indicates that limitations argued by the Applicants but deemed not to be in the claim language, were not considered by the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that Section 12 of the Office Action was referring to Sections of the arguments of the Applicants' Amendment A, such as the reference on page 9 defining a transaction management engine. No claims or matters of substance were discussed.

### The Claims are not Anticipated

**Claims 1-17** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Bull.

In responding to arguments made in conjunction with the Applicants' Amendment A, i.e. that Bull does not disclose or suggest providing information to, for and about a user or about, for and to associates of the user, the Office Action asserts that Bull discloses a user and advertisers. However, it is respectfully submitted that advertisers are not "associates of the user" as the phrase is used in the present application.

In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the Applicants may be their own lexicographer. For a discussion of the phrase "associate(s) of the user" the attention of the Examiner is directed, for example, to the remarks on pages 6 and 7 of the Applicants' Amendment A, as well as the references to the specification made therein.

Additionally, **claim 1** has been amended to recite an access management engine for maintaining security of the system wherein the access management engine is

operative to hold records of at least one user and associates of the user and information to which the at least one user and associates have *shared access* and to provide permission for accessing the at least one database.

It is respectfully submitted that Bull does not disclose or suggest an access management engine wherein the user and associates have shared access to information. For example, even if advertisers are considered to be associates of the user, the user and the advertisers do not share access to information in a database. For example, it is respectfully submitted that Bull does not disclose or suggest that the advertisers have access to the profile information of the user. Likewise, it is respectfully submitted that the user does not have access to the advertising data store **250** of the advertiser. Instead, it is respectfully submitted that the advertisers of Bull request reports about a community of users and information about the community of users is collected and provided in reports to the advertisers. However, it is respectfully submitted that Bull does not disclose or suggest that the users have access to that reported information.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claim 1**, as well as **claims 2-11**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Bull.

Furthermore, **claim 1** recites a transaction management engine operative to manage transaction information and move the transaction information to and from the database. In this regard, the Office Action asserts that Bull discloses a transaction management engine and directs the attention of the Applicants to column 11, lines 64-67. However, the referenced section briefly defines a session management system which tracks and records a user's browser activity, sets ID tokens, establishes accounts, translates anonymous users to named users and manages the users' implicit profile information. It is respectfully submitted that a session management system is not a "transaction management engine" as the phrase is used in the present application.

Again, it respectfully submitted that the Applicants may be their own lexicographer. For discussion of the phrase "transaction management engine" the attention of the Examiner is directed, for example, to the discussion beginning toward the bottom of page 9 of the Applicants' Amendment A and to portions of the specification referenced therein.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claim 1**, as well as **claims 2-11**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Bull.

**Claims 12-17** were rejected under the same rational as **claims 1-11**. Arguments similar to those submitted in support of **claims 1-11** are submitted in support of **claims 12-17**.

Additionally, **claim 12** recites an information receiver operative to review and possibly store information pushed at the information and communication system from outside information communication system. In this regard, the Office Action directs the attention of the Applicants to disclosure in Bull related to an "advertising report that includes ad/coupon appended to information, aggregation and synthesis system along with known information about user is stored in advertising activity data store" found in column 8, lines 59-64. However, it is respectfully submitted that nothing in the referenced section discloses or suggests that information is pushed at the information and communication system from outside the information and communication system, or that information, is reviewed and possibly stored (i.e., based on the review) by an information receiver.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that **claim 12**, as well as **claims 13-17**, which depend therefrom, is not anticipated by Bull.

**TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

In the interests of advancing this application to issue, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-17 remain in the application. For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance. An early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

March 7, 2005

Date



Joseph D. Dreher  
Reg. No. 37,123  
Thomas Tillander  
Reg. No. 47,334  
1100 Superior Avenue  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
(216) 861-5582

**Certificate of Mailing**

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop: AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Express Mail Label No.:	
EV 495000551 US	
Date	
3-7-05	

N:\LUTZ\200034\IEW0002316V001.doc

Signature	
	
Printed Name	
Rita Sauer	